Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED
991705 APR 19 2000
OFFICE OF THE CLERK

NO. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, BARBARA HAYES, ARUN JADHAV, CURTIS W. McDONALD, JOSEPH JONES,
Cross-Petitioners,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA EX REL. CHANDRA MITTAL, Ph.D.,
Cross-Respondent,
v.
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Cross-Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

CONDITIONAL CROSS-PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

JOHN CORNYN
Attorney General of Texas

GREGORY S. COLEMAN
Solicitor General

ANDY TAYLOR
First Assistant Atty General

ANTOINETTE HUNTER
Chief, General Litigation
Counsel of Record

LINDA S. EADS
Deputy Attorney General
for Litigation

Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548 (MC 019)
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 463-2120

ATTORNEYS FOR CROSS-PETITIONERS

24pp

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1. Did Congress intend to include the States and their officials, in their official capacities, within its definition of the word "persons" in the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, *et seq.* (West Supp. 1998) and, thereby, subject the States to liability for treble damages and civil penalties under the Act?[1]

---

[1] This question of whether states are persons under the FCA is presented in *U.S. ex rel. Stevens v. State of Vt. Agency of Natural Resources*, 162 F.3d 195 (2nd Cir. 1998), *petition for cert. granted*, 119 S.Ct. 2391 (June 24, 1999) (No. 98-1828), *argued Nov. 29, 1999.* That question is also presented by cross-petition in *U.S. ex rel. Foulds v. Texas Tech Univ.*, 171 F.3d 279 (5th Cir. 1999), *petition for cert. filed*, 68 U.S.L.W. 3138 (Aug. 23, 1999) (No. 99-321), *petition for cert. filed*, 68 U.S.L.W. 315 (U.S. Aug. 27, 1999) (No. 99-365), *cross-petition for cert. filed, (Aug. 27, 1999)*(No. 99-513), and by cross-petition in *U.S. ex rel. James Churchill v. The State of Texas, et al.*; No. 98-50605 (5th Cir. Aug. 5, 1999), *petition for cert filed, Nov. 3, 1999*, No. 99-779, *petition for cert. filed, Nov. 2, 1999*, No. 99-774, *cross-petition for cert. filed, Dec. 2, 1999*, No. 99-956.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW i

TABLE OF CONTENTS ii

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES iii

CITATION TO CASE AS REPORTED BELOW vii

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION viii

STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED 1

STATEMENT OF THE CASE 2

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE CROSS-PETITION 3

1. The Court Should Resolve The Circuit Conflict Over Whether Congress Intended To Include The States Within Its Definition of "Persons" In The False Claims Act. 5

CONCLUSION 14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases ***Page***

Alden v. Maine, 119 S. Ct. 2240 (1999) 4

Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc., 467 U.S. 837 (1984) 12

City of Newport v. Fact Concerts, Inc., 453 U.S. 247 (1981) 7

College Sav. Bank v. Florida Prepaid Post Secondary Educ. Expense Bd., 119 S. Ct. 2219 (1999) 13

Gozlon-Peretz v. U.S., 498 U.S. 395 (1991) 9

Gregory v. Ashcroft, 501 U.S. 452 (1991) 13

Hilton v. South Carolina Public Railways Comm'n., 502 U.S. 197 (1991) 12, 13

International Primate Protection League v. Admin. of Tulane Educational Fund, 500 U. S. 72 (1991) 9

Kentucky v. Graham, 479 U.S. 159 (1986) 10

Marathon Oil Co. v. A.G. Ruhrgas, 145 F.3d 211 (5th Cir. 1998),(en banc), *rev'd* 526 U.S. 574 (1999) 4

Mississippi Poultry Ass'n., Inc. v. Madigan, 31 F.3d 293 (5th Cir. 1994) 12

Northcross v. Bd. of Educ. of Memphis City Schools, 412 U.S. 427 (1973) 11

Parden v. Terminal Ry. of Alabama State Docks Dept., 377 U.S. 184 (1964) 13

Pennhurst State School and Hosp. v. Halderman, 451 U.S. 1 (1981) 13

U.S. v. Bornstein, 423 U.S. 303 (1976) 10

U.S. v. Cooper Corp., 312 U.S. 600 (1941) 9, 12

U.S. v. Rodriguez, 60 F.3d 193 (5th Cir. 1995), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1000 (1995) 11

U.S. ex rel. Foulds v. Texas Tech Univ., 171 F.3d 279 (5th Cir. 1999), *petition for cert. filed*, 68 U.S.L.W. 3138 (Aug. 23, 1999) (No. 99-321), petition for cert. filed, 68 U.S.L.W. 315 (U.S. Aug. 27, 1999) (No. 99-365), *cross-petition for cert. filed*, (Aug. 27, 1999)(No. 99-513) ..... i, 3-6, 14

U.S. ex rel. James Churchill v. The State of Texas, et al., No. 98-50605 (5th Cir. Aug. 5, 1999), *petition for cert. filed, Nov. 3, 1999*, No. 99-779, *petition for cert. filed, Nov. 2, 1999*, No. 99-774, *cross-petition for cert. filed, Dec. 2, 1999*, No. 99-956 ..... i, 6

U.S. ex rel. Long v. SCS Business & Technical Institute Inc., 173 F.3d 890 (D.C. Cir., 1999) (*Long II*), *petition for cert. filed, Aug. 2, 1999*, No. 99-213 4

U.S. ex rel. Long v. SCS Business and Technical Institute, Inc., 173 F.3d 870 (D.C. Cir. 1999)(*Long I*), *petition for cert. filed* (Aug.2, 1999)(No. 99-213) 6, 11, 12, 14

U.S. ex rel. Riley v. St. Luke's Episcopal Hosp., 1999 WL 1034213 (5th Cir. Nov. 15, 1999) *en banc reh'g granted* 5

U.S. ex rel. Stevens v. State of Vt. Agency of Natural Resources, 162 F.3d 195 (2nd Cir. 1998), *petition for cert. granted*, 119 S.Ct. 2391 (June 24, 1999) (No. 98-1828), *argued Nov. 29, 1999* ..... i, 3, 5, 6

U.S. ex rel. Weinberger v. State of Fla., 615 F. 2d 1370 (5th Cir. 1980) 12

U.S. ex rel. Zissler v. Regents of The University of Minnesota, 154 F.3d 870 (8th Cir. 1998) 5, 6, 13

U.S. v. Bass, 404 U.S. 336 (1971) 6

Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police, 491 U.S. 58 (1989) 9, 10, 13, 14

Wilson v. Omaha Indian Tribe, 442 U.S. 653 (1979), *cert. denied* 449 U.S. 825, 101 S.Ct. 87 (1980) 9, 14

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 1254(1) viii

31 U.S.C. § 3729, *et seq.* ..... i, 1, 4, 12

31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(1) 3, 8, 12

31 U.S.C. § 3733 ..... 8, 9

31 U.S.C. § 3733(1) 8

31 U.S.C. § 3733(l)(4) 9

31 U.S.C. § 380 11

42 U.S.C. § 52(3) 11

Act of March 2, 1863, ch. 67 § 3, 12 Stat. 698 10

Pub. L. 99-562 § 3, Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3153 11

Other Authorities

Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 3d Sess. 955-56 (1863) 10

H. R. REP. No. 94-1343 (1976) 8

H.R. REP. No. 2, part 2 (1862) 11

S. REP. No. 96-657 12

S. REP. No. 96-657 at 2-4 12

S. REP. No. 99-345, at 8 ..... 11, 12

CITATION TO CASE AS REPORTED BELOW

Neither the opinion of the court of appeals (Petitioner's Appendix C at 20a - 21a) nor the opinion of the district court (Petitioner's Appendix A at 1a - 17a) is reported.

STATEMENT OF JURISDICTION

The judgment of the court of appeals was entered on December 20, 1999. No petition for rehearing was filed. Mittal filed his Petition for Writ of Certiorari on March 20, 2000; No. 99-1566. The United States filed its Petition for Writ of Certiorari on March 20, 2000; No.99-1544. This Court has jurisdiction to review the judgment pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1254(1).

No. _____

In the Supreme Court of the United States

TEXAS SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY, BARBARA HAYES, ARUN JADHAV, CURTIS W. McDONALD, JOSEPH JONES,
Cross-Petitioners,
v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA EX REL.
CHANDRA MITTAL, Ph.D.,
Cross-Respondent,
v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Cross-Respondent.

On Petition for Writ of Certiorari to the
United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

CONDITIONAL CROSS-PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

STATUTORY PROVISION INVOLVED

31 U.S.C. § 3729

False claims

(a) Liability for certain acts
Any person who–
(1) knowingly presents, or causes to be presented, to an officer or employee of the United States Government . . . a false or fraudulent claim for payment or approval;

> (2) knowingly makes, uses, or causes to be made or used, a false record or statement to get a false or fraudulent claim paid or approved by the Government;
>
> . . . .
>
> (7) knowingly makes, uses, or causes to be made or used, a false record or statement to conceal, avoid, or decrease an obligation to pay or transmit money or property to the Government, is liable to the United States Government for a civil penalty of not less than $5,000 and not more than $10,000, plus 3 times the amount of damages which the Government sustains because of the act of that person. . . . A person violating this subsection shall also be liable to the United States Government for the costs of a civil action brought to recover any such penalty or damages.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Relator Chandra Mittal filed this *qui tam* action under seal on February 21, 1997 in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. Mittal alleged that defendants violated the FCA by submitting false claims to the United States through the Research Center in Minority Institutions ("RCMI") program, a division of the National Institutes of Health ("NIH"). Specifically, relator alleged that in violation of applicable laws and regulations, defendants submitted grant applications to the RCMI representing that the faculty hired under the RCMI program would become university employees after the funding ended. When the RCMI program grant expired, the university terminated Dr. Mittal's employment.

On June 17, 1997, the government filed its election to decline intervention. The District Court then ordered the complaint unsealed on June 18, 1997. After being served with the complaint, defendants moved to dismiss on August 20, 1997 contending, first that the Eleventh Amendment precludes the suit, and second, that the state and its officials, in their official capacities, are not "persons" under the FCA.

The District Court in an order dated January 20, 1999 denied defendants motion' on both grounds. (Petitioner's Appendix A at 1a - 17a).

On December 20, 1999, the Fifth Circuit dismissed the appeal holding that it was controlled by *U.S. ex rel. Foulds v. Texas Tech Univ.*, 171 F.3d 279 294 (5th Cir. 1999) (holding that "when the United States has not actively intervened in the action, the Eleventh Amendment bars *qui tam* plaintiffs from instituting suits against the sovereign states in federal court"), *petition for cert. filed,* 68 U.S.L.W. 3138 (Aug. 23, 1999) (No. 99-321), *petition for cert. filed,* 68 U.S.L.W. 315 (U.S. Aug. 27, 1999) (No. 99-365), *cross-petition for cert. filed,* (Aug. 27, 1999)(No. 99-513), *See also, U.S. ex rel. Stevens v. State of Vt. Agency of Natural Resources*, 162 F.3d 195 (2nd Cir. 1998), *petition for cert. granted*, 119 S.Ct. 2391 (June 24, 1999) (No. 98-1828), *argued Nov. 29, 1999.* The Fifth Circuit did not reach the question presented by the Cross-Petition.

REASONS FOR GRANTING THE CROSS-PETITION

If this Court accepts the Petitions for Certiorari in this case, it is important that it consider the alternative question presented below by state defendants: whether Congress intended in the False Claims Act to extend liability to the states by including them and their officials, in their official capacities, in the term "person" in § 3729(a)(1). In the *Foulds* case the Fifth Circuit panel in its opinion, decided that the Eleventh Amendment barred a *qui tam*

relator's suit against a state when the United States did not intervene and determined, further, that it lacked the subject matter jurisdiction to proceed to decide the statutory question of whether the State is a "person" under the False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, *et seq.* (West Supp. 1998) and, thereby, subject to liability for treble damages and civil penalties under the Act. The Fifth Circuit panel deciding *Mittal* followed the *Foulds* panel decision and did not revisit whether it was appropriate to decide the "persons" issue even though the decision of this Court in *Ruhrgas*, issued after the *Foulds* decision, undermined the reasoning used by the *Foulds* panel to preclude reaching that question. *Marathon Oil Co. v. A.G. Ruhrgas*, 145 F.3d 211, 222-23 (5th Cir. 1998),(en banc), *rev'd* 526 U.S. 574 (1999).

However, because Congress can subject a state to suit in the exercise of its Constitutional authority despite the state's sovereignty, whether Congress intended to create a cause of action against a state by a private party or by the federal government is "a . . . logical prerequisite to the jurisdictional inquiry." *U.S. ex rel. Long v. SCS Business & Technical Institute Inc.*, 173 F.3d 890, 894 (D.C. Cir., 1999) (*Long II*), *petition for cert. filed, Aug. 2, 1999*, No. 99-213. *See Alden v. Maine*, 119 S. Ct. 2240, 2246-2248 (1999).

The Fifth Circuit's decision leaves open two questions which, while "live," implicate important federalism concerns and create uncertainty between the states and the federal government as they share responsibility for the administration of taxpayer programs: first, whether a *qui tam* suit under the FCA is allowed against a state if the United States intervenes at some point in the litigation; second, whether a suit under the FCA for treble damages and civil penalties is allowed against a state if commenced by the United States. The uniqueness of states in relation to other potential defendants who could be sued by the federal government under the FCA makes determining if Congress even intended to create a cause of action against states an inquiry into whether Congress

saw the False Claims Act as an appropriate assertion of federal supremacy. If this Court determines that a state is not a "person" for the purpose of liability under the Act, these questions disappear and the Act becomes a pragmatic exercise of Congressional power to apprehend and punish private persons who defraud the government.[2]

1. The Court Should Resolve The Circuit Conflict Over Whether Congress Intended To Include The States Within Its Definition of "Persons" In The False Claims Act.

Resolution of the "persons" question is necessary because of a conflict in the circuits. The Eighth Circuit and the Second Circuit have found congressional intent to include the states in the definition of "person," and the District of Columbia Circuit has found no support for the inclusion.

The Eighth Circuit declined in *U.S. ex rel. Zissler v. Regents of The University of Minnesota*, 154 F.3d 870 (8th Cir. 1998) to apply the statutory presumption against including sovereigns in the term "person" stating that it applied only to the enacting sovereign

---

[2] Recent opinions have suggested other constitutional problems with the FCA. "[I]t should be noted that FCA *qui tam* suits stand on shaky constitutional ground with respect to the principle of separation of powers as embodied in Article II's Appointments and Take Care Clauses and Article III." *U.S. ex rel. Stevens v. State of Vt. Agency of Natural Resources*, 162 F.3d 195 (2nd Cir. 1998)(Weinstein, J., dissenting), *petition for cert. granted*, 119 S.Ct. 2391 (June 24, 1999) (No. 98-1828), *argued Nov.29, 1999*. The Fifth Circuit acknowledged these concerns. *Foulds*, 171 F.3d at 292 n. 21.

A split panel of the Fifth Circuit has determined that the False Claims Act violates the Take-Care Clause of the Constitution and the doctrine of separation of powers. One justice concurring would have affirmed the district court finding that a *qui tam* plaintiff lacks standing. *U.S. ex rel. Riley v. St. Luke's Episcopal Hosp.*, 1999 WL 1034213 (5th Cir. Nov. 15, 1999) *en banc reh'g granted*.

and only when the purpose of the statute was in doubt. *Id.* at 874. The *Zissler* court perceived the FCA as having a broad remedial purpose which justified placing the burden on the state to show a specific exemption from the reach of the Act. In similar fashion, the Second Circuit found that the FCA did not alter the constitutional balance of federal and state power and refused to apply the "plain statement" rule explained in *U.S. v. Bass*, 404 U.S. 336, 349 (1971). *U.S. ex rel. Stevens v. State of Vt. Agency of Natural Resources*, 162 F.3d 195 (2nd Cir. 1998), *petition for cert. granted*, 119 S.Ct. 2391 (June 24, 1999) (No. 98-1828), *argued Nov. 29, 1999. Stevens* reasoned that the goal of the FCA was to deter and remedy fraud and because "the states have no right or authority, traditional or otherwise, to engage in such conduct," no federalism concerns were implicated. *Id.* at 203. However, the D.C. Circuit accepted that "states are excluded from the term person absent an affirmative contrary showing" and found no textual support or support in the legislative environment or in the legislative history for including states in the term "person" in the FCA. *U.S. ex rel. Long v. SCS Business and Technical Institute, Inc.*, 173 F.3d 870 (D.C. Cir. 1999)(*Long I*), *petition for cert. filed* (Aug.2, 1999)(No. 99-213)

False Claims Act litigation is expensive for states and exposes the state fisc to significant liability. As the *Foulds* court noted, Foulds alleged over 400,000 false claims based on incorrect Medicare and Medicaid billings, each of which could bring fines between $5,000 and $10,000, and the trebling of $20 million in overpayments. 171 F.3d at 282 n.1. If the state is subject to the FCA under the allegations in *Foulds*, it could face between $2 billion and $4 billion in fines and $60 million in damages. Churchill, in his case against the state agencies in Texas which are delegated the authority and responsibility to administer the Medicaid program, alleged that, at minimum, 25% of the 3825 cases handled per month in Texas have potential third-party liability that is allegedly recoverable, and estimated the potential recovery in excess of $100 million per year. In *U.S. ex rel. James*

Churchill v. The State of Texas, et al., No. 98-50605 (5th Cir. Aug. 5, 1999), *petition for cert. filed, Nov. 3, 1999*, No. 99-779, *petition for cert. filed, Nov. 2, 1999*, No. 99-774, *cross-petition for cert. filed, Dec. 2, 1999*, No. 99-956. Relator Churchill hopes to prove over 66,000 false claims based on inadequate pursuit of subrogation rights, each of which could result in a fine of $5,000 or $10,000 and the trebling of $600 million in excessive federal payments. In the instant lawsuit, Relator Mittal asked the Court for the following relief:

1. The sum of $13,329,288.00, which represents three (3) times the amount of the MBRS Grant awarded to TSU, and $355,566.00, which represents three (3) times the amount of the Supplemental MBRS Grant awarded to TSU;

2. The sum of $28,774,374.00 which represents three (3) times the amount of the RCMI Grant awarded to TSU;

3. Three times the currently unknown sum of monies awarded to TSU under a CDS Ph.D. Training Program Grant;

4. Statutory damages in the amount of $10,000.00 per each individual claim found by the Court to have been made to the United States Government.

It is not sound public policy to burden blameless taxpayers with huge damage awards for the supposed benefit of the federal government.[3] *See City of Newport v. Fact Concerts, Inc.*, 453 U.S. 247, 263, 266-67 (1981) (recognizing that "[n]either reason nor

---

[3] Damages available under the False Claims Act were raised from double damages to treble damages when the Act was amended in 1986. It could be argued that the sole purpose was to make the bounty more attractive to the *qui tam* plaintiff.

justice" suggests that retribution in the form of punitive damages should be visited upon blameless and unknowing taxpayers).

Under basic rules of statutory construction, states should not be considered "persons" when that term is used in 31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(1), the liability-creating section of the FCA. The word "person" is not defined generally in the Act or for purposes of this section and there is no reference to "states" in this section. Section 1 of Title 1 of the United State Code-Rules of Construction dictates that "[when] determining the meaning of any Act of Congress, unless the context indicates otherwise . . . the words 'person' and 'whoever' include corporations, companies, associations, firms, partnerships, societies, and joint stock companies, as well as individuals." Missing from this broad application of the word "person" are states, state entities or other governmental entities.

The statutory language of the False Claims Act only includes the states in its definition of a "person" as it pertains to civil investigative demands under 31 U.S.C. § 3733.[4] Section 3733, added in 1986, plainly states that the definitions contained there apply "[f]or purposes of this section." *See* § 3733(1).[5] The fact

---

[4]Because states are frequently partners in the disbursement of federal funds under New Federalism, it is not surprising that Congress saw fit to provide that the Department of Justice could confidentially get information from them without court involvement or complaints about the cost during the process of deciding whether grounds exist for initiating false claim actions against private contractors.

[5] When Congress added § 3733 to the FCA it borrowed the provision from the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvement Act of 1976. The legislative history for the Hart-Scott-Rodino Act explains that the civil investigative demand provisions of that Act are intended to reach "'target and non-target' third parties with relevant information." H. R. REP. No. 94-1343 (1976).

that "person" is defined as including a state entity for "purposes of this section [§ 3733]" argues against congressional intent to include the states within the scope of "person" in the liability-creating sections of the Act. 31 U.S.C. § 3733(l)(4). "[W]here Congress include[s] particular language in one section of a statute but omits it in another section of the same Act, it is generally presumed that Congress acts intentionally and purposely in the disparate inclusion or exclusion." *Gozlon-Peretz v. U.S.*, 498 U.S. 395, 404 (1991)(citations omitted).

The Court in 1979 noted that "in common usage, the term 'person' does not include the sovereign, [and] statutes employing the [word] are ordinarily construed to exclude it." It observed that this was "[p]articularly... true where the statute imposes a burden or limitation, as distinguished from conferring a benefit or advantage."[6] *Wilson v. Omaha Indian Tribe*, 442 U.S. 653, 667 (1979), *cert. denied* 449 U.S. 825, 101 S.Ct. 87 (1980) (internal quotes and citations omitted) (construing a statute which prevented and provided remedies against non-Indian squatters on Indian lands). The Court repeated the rule that in ordinary usage the term "person" does not include states in *Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police*, 491 U.S. 58 (1989). *Will* also noted that the Congress of 1863, when the False Claims Act was originally

---

[6] Relying on *U.S. v. Cooper Corp.*, 312 U.S. 600, 604 (1941), *Wilson* went on to note that there was "no hard and fast rule of exclusion, and much depends on the context, the subject matter, legislative history, and executive interpretation." *Wilson*, 442 U.S. at 667. However, in *International Primate Protection League v. Admin. of Tulane Educational Fund*, 500 U. S. 72, 83 (1991), the Court put *Cooper* in context by characterizing the rule that the word "person" does not include the sovereign as a presumption that must be overcome.

enacted, would not have assumed that "person" included states. *Will*, 491 U.S. at 68 nn. 8 & 9.[7]

The False Claims Act was intended "to stop the massive frauds by large contractors, during the Civil War." *U.S. v. Bornstein*, 423 U.S. 303, 309 (1976). As originally enacted, it mandated imprisonment, a remedy which could not apply to a state. Act of March 2, 1863, ch. 67 § 3, 12 Stat. 698. The word "person" in the section creating civil liability in the Act has not been amended since it was originally enacted in 1863.

Nor does the legislative history of the Act suggest congressional intent to subject states to suit. This is highlighted by the sponsor of the Act, Senator Howard, who said the purpose of the Act was to

> hold out to a confederate a strong temptation to betray his coconspirator, and bring him to justice. . . . I have based the [provisions] upon the old-fashioned idea of holding out a temptation, and "setting a rogue to catch a rogue" which is the safest and most expeditious way I have ever discovered of bringing rogues to justice.

Cong. Globe, 37th Cong., 3d Sess. 955-56 (1863) (cited in *Foulds*, 171 F.3d at 293). The House Select Committee, which investigated Civil War fraud prior to the passage of the FCA, issued a report in December of 1861 that discussed allegations of "personal aggrandizement" on the part of state officials in Indiana, Ohio, New York and Illinois. The discussion of the problem does not reveal any intent to subject the states to liability for fraud but,

---

[7]A suit for monetary relief against a state official in his official capacity is treated, for Eleventh Amendment purposes, as a suit against the State. *Kentucky v. Graham*, 479 U.S. 159, 169 (1986).

instead, shows that states were thought of as partners in "demand[ing] the highest integrity of those invested with public trusts, and each [the states and the federal government] should hold their agents, by rigid scrutiny, to severe accountability." H.R. REP. No. 2, part 2 (1862).

The False Claims Act was amended in 1986 and the definition of "person" was not changed to include states. Pub. L. 99-562 § 3, Oct. 27, 1986, 100 Stat. 3153. The amendments to the FCA were passed by the same Congress that passed the Program Fraud Civil Penalties Act (PFCPA), 31 U.S.C. § 380, *et seq.* and the Anti-Kickback Act of 1986, 42 U.S.C. § 52(3). These Acts create liability for similar conduct. The PFCPA and the Anti-Kickback Act define "person" and their definitions also do not include states. In fact, in each of these Acts, the word "organization" is clarified by the word "private." The traditional statutory construction principle of *in pari materia* establishes that the use of a word in one statute which is *in pari materia* with another statute is persuasive of its meaning in the other. *U.S. v. Rodriguez*, 60 F.3d 193, 196 (5th Cir. 1995), *cert. denied*, 516 U.S. 1000 (1995). When Congress uses the same forms of statutory language in different statutes having the same general purpose, courts presume that Congress intended the same interpretation to apply in each instance. *Northcross v. Bd. of Educ. of Memphis City Schools*, 412 U.S. 427, 428 (1973).

The only legislative history supporting the inclusion of states as defendants in the FCA is not deserving of any weight. *Long I*, 173 F.3d at 878. The Senate Report that accompanied the 1986 amendments noted that the False Claims Act "reaches all parties who may submit false claims. The term 'person' is used in its broad sense to include partnerships, associations, and corporations . . . as well as states and political subdivisions." S. REP. No. 99-345, at 8 (internal citations omitted). This statement is not entitled to any weight because it does not describe the 1986 amendments but is part of the "history of the False Claims Act and Court

Interpretation" section which was a repeat of a background discussion contained in an earlier Senate Report which had accompanied a failed effort to amend the False Claims Act in 1979-80. Compare S. REP. No. 99-345 at 8-10 with S. REP. No. 96-657 at 2-4. At the time the statement was written, it was incorrect because there was no legislative evidence or case on point indicating that "person" in the False Claims Act included the states. The one court that had addressed the issue in a case, which admittedly has no precedential value, held that states were not "persons" under the Act. *U.S. ex rel. Weinberger v. State of Fla.*, 615 F. 2d 1370 (5th Cir. 1980); *see Long I*, 173 F.3d at 879. The language from S. REP. No. 99-345 was irrelevant to the proposed amendments, and the report's "section-by-section" analysis did not describe the liability provision of the Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729, as subjecting the states to any liability, even though that section was amended to increase the double damage provision to a treble damage provision and to enhance the civil penalties.

If there is no ambiguity when a statute is read in its natural way, the inquiry should end. *Chevron U.S.A., Inc. v. Natural Resources Defense Council, Inc.*, 467 U.S. 837, 842-43 (1984). *See also Mississippi Poultry Ass'n., Inc. v. Madigan*, 31 F.3d 293, 299 (5th Cir. 1994). A plain reading of 31 U.S.C. § 3729(a)(1), the liability creating section of the FCA, does not indicate that states are subject to liability. Even if the Court considers the *Cooper* factors (purpose of the statute, subject matter, context, legislative history and executive interpretation), it should conclude that states were not intended as defendants in the FCA. *See U.S. v. Cooper Corp.*, 312 U.S. 600, 605 (1941).

However, if the Court determines that the statute is ambiguous, the rule of *Hilton v. South Carolina Public Railways Comm'n.*, 502 U.S. 197, 206 (1991), instructs that "a plain statement" rule should be used to interpret federal statutes which, if applied to

states, could subject them to monetary liability.[8] Thus, absent a clear statement that a statute applies to the states, a court should find that the statute does not apply. As observed in *Will*, when Congress "intends to alter the 'usual constitutional balance between the States and the Federal Government,' it must make its intention to do so unmistakably clear in the language of the statute." *Will*, 491 U.S. at 65. *Will* explicitly notes that this rule cannot be limited to Eleventh Amendment cases. *Id.* *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, which is not an Eleventh Amendment case, relies on the same line of cases relied on by *Will* for the proposition that the "plain statement rule is nothing more than an acknowledgment that the states retain substantial sovereign powers under our constitutional scheme, powers with which Congress does not readily interfere." *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452, 461. The requirement of a clear statement exists even when the suit is brought by the federal government.[9] Citing *Pennhurst*,[10] *Will* noted that Congress should make its intention clear if it intends to

---

[8] *Hilton* did not apply the "plain statement" rule because of *stare decisis* and the reliance that had been placed on a previous construction of the Federal Employers' Liability Act (FELA). However, in resting on stare decisis, *Hilton* acknowledged that in most cases *Will* and *Gregory v. Ashcroft*, 501 U.S. 452 (1991), should be followed. *Hilton*, 502 U.S. at 566. Additionally, *Hilton* relied on *Parden v. Terminal Ry. of Alabama State Docks Dept.*, 377 U.S. 184 (1964), which has been overruled. *See College Sav. Bank v. Florida Prepaid Post Secondary Educ. Expense Bd.*, 119 S. Ct. 2219 (1999).

[9] The "real party in interest" analysis applied by the Eighth Circuit is irrelevant to determining Congressional intent to include states as parties subject to liability in drafting the False Claims Act. *Zissler*, 154 F. 3d at 872. For purposes of determining whether applying the FCA to the states affects the federal-state balance, Texas maintains that the treble damages and civil penalties are enough of an intrusion on federal-state relations to require applicability of the "clear statement" rule.

[10] *Pennhurst State School and Hosp. v. Halderman*, 451 U.S. 1, 16 (1981).

impose a condition on the grant of federal moneys. *Will*, 491 U.S. at 65. The general rule is stated in *U.S. v. Bass*, 404 U.S. 336, 349 (1971), also cited in *Will*,

> [in] traditionally sensitive areas, such as legislation affecting the federal balance, the requirement of a clear statement assures that the legislature has in fact faced, and intended to bring into issue, the critical matters involved in the judicial decision.

Id. Far from a "clear statement, as the Fifth Circuit observed, "no relevant provision of the Act explicitly mentions states as defendants." *Foulds*, 171 F.3d at 294.

If Congress intends to treat states as if they could be guilty of fraud against the federal government, and if it intends to subject the states' treasuries to the treble damages and civil penalties of a statute like the FCA, it should be obligated by federalism concerns to state its intention clearly. If the rule established by *Wilson* and *Will* has any meaning at all, it must create at minimum a default rule; states are excluded from the term "person" absent an affirmative contrary showing. *Long I*, 173 F.3d at 874.

CONCLUSION

Cross-Petitioners respectfully request, if the Court grants Mittal's petition, No. 99-1566 or the United States' petition, No. 99-1544, that it also grant this cross-petition and affirm the judgment of the Fifth Circuit in finding the False Claims Act *qui tam* provisions unconstitutional under the Eleventh Amendment or affirm the Fifth Circuit's dismissal of Mittal's suit by finding that the states and/or state officials were not persons for liability purposes under the False Claims Act.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN CORNYN
Attorney General of Texas

ANDY TAYLOR
First Assistant Attorney General

LINDA EADS
Deputy Attorney General
for Litigation

GREGORY S. COLEMAN
Solicitor General

ANTOINETTE HUNTER
Chief, General Litigation Division
Attorney of Record
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
(512) 463-2120

COUNSEL FOR CROSS-PETITIONERS